A global view of quantum computation with noisy components

Erik Aurell*
Dept. of Computational Biology and Center for Quantum Materials,
KTH – Royal Institute of Technology, AlbaNova University Center, SE-106 91 Stockholm, Sweden
Depts. Applied Physics and Computer Science, Aalto University, P.O. Box 11100, FI-00076 AALTO, Finland
Institute of Theoretical Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, P.O. Box 2735, Beijing 100190, China

arXiv:1606.09407v2 [quant-ph] 25 Nov 2016

The operation of a quantum computer is considered as a general quantum operation on a mixed state on many qubits followed by a measurement. The general quantum operation is further represented as a Feynman-Vernon double path integral over the histories of the qubits and of an environment, and afterward tracing out the environment. The qubit histories are taken to be paths on the two-sphere S^2 as in Klauder's coherent-state path integral of spin, and the environment is assumed to consist of harmonic oscillators initially in thermal equilibrium, and linearly coupled to to qubit operators $\hat{S}_z$. The environment can then be integrated out to give a Feynman-Vernon influence action coupling the forward and backward history of each qubit. This representation allows to derive in a simple way an estimate that the total error of operation of a quantum computer scales linearly with the number of qubits and the time of operation, and allows to quantitatively discuss counter-arguments against quantum computing advanced by Kalai. This line of reasoning is applied to simple examples, and to Kitaev's toric code.

PACS numbers: 03.65.Yz,05.70.Ln,05.40.-a

I. INTRODUCTION

Quantum computers are physical devices that manipulate quantum states to execute information-processing tasks [1]. To build a general-purpose quantum computer is a difficult experimental challenge where several different realizations have been proposed since the 1990ies [2, 3]. The current state-of-the-art is that around ten qubits can be manipulated in the lab in a manner approaching to what would be required for a general-purpose quantum computer [4]. For more restricted computational tasks control over more qubits have been demonstrated; the commercial company D-Wave has presented a device using 1000 qubits [5] which has been reported to lead to important speed-up over classical algorithms [6].

The perspective of quantum computers has generated a large body of theoretical work pursued both in physics and computer science [7]. A principal difficulty is that a large quantum computer necessarily cannot be a small system in the physical sense of having few degrees of freedom, and large physical systems have a strong tendency to turn classical [8]. The underlying mechanism of this quantum-to-classical transition is the decoherence of the quantum state by interactions between the quantum computer and the rest of the world [9]. Not all large physical systems turn classical: macroscopic quantum states exist, such as superconductivity in metals and other compounds at low temperatures, super-fluidity in He^4 and He^3 and and Bose-Einstein condensates in cold atoms. These naturally occurring systems are however not made up of many individually controllable parts, as a quantum computer must have.

The operation of an ideal quantum computer without decoherence can be cast in a language similar to information theory where the elementary operations (quantum gates) are implemented as unitary transformations on a pure quantum state, acting on a few qubits at a time [10, 11]. The errors made in a quantum computation due to decoherence were quantitatively discussed by Aharonov, Kitaev and Nisan in [12] using a formalism where the state is a density matrix and the transformations are quantum operations mapping density matrices to density matrices. The quantum operations were then patterned after unitary quantum gates and assumed to factorize both over operations and between qubits which are not acted upon by the same operation. The computational power of such a quantum computer can hence be expressed as properties of networks of "noisy quantum gates". The main conclusion of [12] is that if a quantum computer makes L quantum operations (operates L quantum gates in total, counted with multiplicity) each with error ϵ, then the combined error of the total operation scales as $L\epsilon$. While this estimate requires higher accuracy the larger the quantum computer, it is a cornerstone of the quantum computing field.

The purpose of this paper is to discuss the errors in quantum computing from a global point of view. Indeed, since the error grow with the size of the system, the results of [12] do not by themselves establish the feasibility of quantum computing, and has therefore motivated a large literature on quantum error correction [13–16]. The factorized error model in [12] is furthermore also an idealization and could either be a "best-case", or a "worst-case". The first possibility was vigorously argued in [17], where it was stressed the factorized model of quantum development does not allow for correlated failure modes between gates separated in time and space. If such failure modes are allowed in a classical setting, as by an

* eaurell@kth.se

adversary in the sense of theoretical computer science then the total error rate could scale faster than linearly with system size, which would make the construction of a functioning quantum computer more difficult. From the opposite point of view, in realistic models of a quantum system interacting with an environment factorization and the closely related concept of a quantum semi-group development only hold at high enough temperatures [18]. Low temperatures, which would anyhow be needed to isolate the quantum system from the environment, lead to non-Markovian processes, and memory effects which could in principle be exploitable. It is therefore physically reasonable to expect that the factorized error model in [12] is in fact a kind of worst case scenario, and that quantum computers can operate with limited error as a whole even when no useful bounds can be set on the separate errors of the interconnected components.

The latter option can be addressed using the global view of the dynamics of open quantum system developed by Feynman and Vernon [19] and investigated in several seminal contributions by Leggett and collaborators [20–23]. As to my knowledge this has not been carried out in the literature, the first goal of the paper is to do so on two simple, but yet illustrative, examples. The second goal is to apply the same reasoning to one of the most well-known abstract models of fault-tolerant quantum computing, Kitaev's toric code [13]. The toric code turns out to be insensitive to the errors generated by a Feynman-Vernon-like interaction with an environment given plausible assumptions on certain sums which will be defined below.

The paper is organized as follows: in Section II I introduce the technical notation and state Kalai's "pessimistic hypothesis" which was the original motivation for this work. In Section III I introduce the basic model of this paper where a quantum operation on n qubits coupled to an environment is modeled by a Feynman-Vernon double path integral and the environment is integrated out. The qubit histories are formulated using Klauder's coherent-state path integral for spin [24, 25], which has found many applications in condensed matter theory in the last decades [26]. In Sections IV and V I discuss two simple models where each qubit is either connected to its own environment, or where all the qubits are connected to one and the same environment. In the first case an Aharonov-Kitaev-Nisan-like estimate follows immediately, while in the second case some physical plausibility arguments are needed. In Section VI I treat Kitaev's toric code interacting with an environment in the same fraemwork, and in Section VII I discuss the conclusions reached. Appendices contain standard material on Klauder's path integral and the Feynman-Vernon theory, included for completeness, as well as a critical discussion of Kalai's "pessimistic hypothesis" as presented in [17].

II. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Let us first recall that a pure quantum state on n qubits is a complex ray in $N = 2^n$-dimensional complex Hilbert space and hence given by $2N - 2$ real numbers. A mixed state on the same n qubits is given by density matrix which is a completely positive Hermitian operator of unit trace on the N-dimensional Hilbert space, and which we will write ρ. The set of all density matrices has dimension $N^2 - 1$. A quantum operation is a linear map from the a set of density matrices to a set of density matrices which we will write Φ. The set of all quantum operations has dimension $N^4 - N^2$. The geometry of density matrices and general operations of a single qubit ($n = 1$, $N = 2$) is well understood as the Bloch sphere and linear transformations of the Bloch sphere, but for higher dimensions there is no such simple picture. The very high dimensionality is only one aspect, a more fundamental one is that the geometry is incompletely known [27].

Let now n qubits start in the pure state $|i >= |i_1, \ldots, i_n >$, density matrix $\rho_i = |i_1, \ldots, i_n\rangle\langle i_1, \ldots, i_n|$, and let there be a unitary quantum operation $\Phi_0\rho_i = U\rho_i U^\dagger$ with the property that if the qubits are measured in the final state then the Boolean vector $\mathbf{f} = (f_1, \ldots, f_k)$ is observed with probability $P_{if}^{(0)} = \langle f|\Phi_0\rho_i|f\rangle$. We will assume that knowing this probability distribution (over $\mathbf{f}$) allows one to solve some interesting computational problem. Let then the system be coupled to an environment and described by a quantum operation Φ and corresponding probabilities $P_{if} = \langle f|\Phi\rho_i|f\rangle$. A basic measure of the error of P_{if} with respect to $P_{if}^{(0)}$ is the variational distance between the two probability distributions:

$$\mathrm{TVD} = \sum_{\mathbf{f}} |P_{if} - P_{if}^{(0)}| \tag{1}$$

Any choice of final observable O taking values o leads to probability distributions P_{io} and $P_{io}^{(0)}$, and it can be shown the maximum of (1) over O is the trace norm $\|\cdot\|_1$ of the difference of the corresponding density matrices [12]. Furthermore, the authors of [12] introduce the *diamond norm* over super-operators and prove the important inequalities $\|\Phi_1\Phi_2\|_\diamond \leq \|\Phi_1\|_\diamond\|\Phi_2\|_\diamond$ (Lemma 12, statement 3) and $\|\Phi\rho\|_1 \leq \|\Phi\|_\diamond\|\rho\|_1$ (Lemma 12, combining statements 1 and 2). For two series of quantum operations that can be written

$$\Phi = \Phi_L\Phi_{L-1}\cdots\Phi_1 \qquad \Phi^{(0)} = \Phi_L^{(0)}\Phi_{L-1}^{(0)}\cdots\Phi_1^{(0)} \tag{2}$$

and where each pair of unitary and noisy quantum operations satisfy $\|\Phi_l - \Phi_l^{(0)}\|_\diamond < \epsilon$ this leads to ([12], Theorem 4)

$$\mathrm{TVD} \leq L \cdot \epsilon \tag{3}$$

Equation (3) has the interpretation that the error rate per quantum operation of a quantum computer is bounded by a constant, and in particular does not increase with the number of qubits the quantum computer is operating on.

Quantum error correction systems are built on physical (small-scale) qubits which are used to build logical (larger-scale) qubits on which the the quantum computation is done. Under reasonable assumptions [14], the linear scaling (3) together with sufficiently small error-rate for individual physical qubits and gates acting on them allows universal quantum computing based on quantum error-correction. Kalai's "pessimistic hypothesis" [17] posits that the necessary small error-rate cannot be maintained for sufficiently large systems of physical qubits which would render high-quality quantum error-correction in particular, and quantum computing in general – impossible for large enough systems.

The problem addressed in this paper is to discuss bounds on the left-hand side of (3) without making assumptions of the same type as in [12]. The polemical objective is hence to circumvent the critique of [17] – and to change the terms of a long-running discussion for and against quantum computing that be retraced from the references cited in [14] – by treating the problem as one of the physics of open quantum system, and not as one of quantum information theory. The tool to do this, used in Sections III–VI, is the Feynman-Vernon formalism. As measurements would usually be performed in some pre-determined way which would often more or less amount to measuring the z-components of all the qubits I will for simplicity assume a given initial state ρ_i and a given final observable, and consider all the variability of the problem to stem from Φ being different from $\Phi^{(0)}$. The trace norm and the diamond norm will therefore not appear in the following.

III. THE OPEN QUANTUM SYSTEM MODEL

The aim of this section is to compare the two probabilities P_{if} and $P_{if}^{(0)}$ in one term in (1) when the quantum computer interacts with a heat bath. The Hamiltonian describing the quantum computer and the bath together is

$$\hat{H} = \hat{H}_S + \hat{H}_I + \hat{H}_B \tag{4}$$

where $\hat{H}_S$ depends only on the variables describing the quantum computer, from hereon also referred to as the system, $\hat{H}_B$ depends only on the bath variables, and $\hat{H}_I$ describes the interaction of the system and the bath. We first consider the system without the heat bath and use the observation that any unitary transformation can be implemented by unitary transformation acting on at most two qubits at a time [10, 11]. The system Hamiltonian will thus be

$$\hat{H}_S = \hbar \sum_a \mu_a \mathbf{S}^a + \hbar \sum_{ab} \mathbf{S}^a \kappa_{ab} \mathbf{S}^b \tag{5}$$

where $\mathbf{S}^a = \{\hat{S}_x^a, \hat{S}_a^y, \hat{S}_a^z\}$ are the spin operators acting on the a'th qubit, μ_a is a 3-vector and κ_{ab} is a 3-by-3 matrix. Both the μ's and the κ's have dimension frequency and can depend on time as required to implement the overall unitary transformation

$$U = \mathcal{T} e^{-\frac{i}{\hbar}\int \hat{H}_S dt} \tag{6}$$

where $\mathcal{T}$ means time ordering. Following the prescription of [24] we insert an overcomplete resolution of the identity and write

$$\langle \mathbf{f}|U|\mathbf{i}\rangle = \int \prod_a \frac{\sin\theta_a^{(i)} d\theta_a^{(i)} d\phi_a^{(i)}}{2\pi} \frac{\sin\theta_a^{(f)} d\theta_a^{(f)} d\phi_a^{(f)}}{2\pi} \langle \mathbf{f}|\theta^{(f)},\phi^{(f)}\rangle K_{cs}(\theta^{(f)},\phi^{(f)},\theta^{(i)},\phi^{(i)}) \langle \theta^{(i)},\phi^{(i)}|\mathbf{i}\rangle \tag{7}$$

where $(\theta_a^{(i)},\phi_a^{(i)})$ and $(\theta_a^{(f)},\phi_a^{(f)})$ parametrize unit spheres, K_{cs} is the coherent-state propagator and $|\theta^{(i)},\phi^{(i)}\rangle$ and $|\theta^{(f)},\phi^{(f)}\rangle$ are the initial and final product coherent states. The unitary quantum operation is given by

$$\Phi_0 \rho = U \rho U^\dagger \tag{8}$$

and the first matrix element we are looking for is

$$\begin{aligned} P_{if}^{(0)} = & \int \prod_a \frac{\sin\theta_a^{(f,F)} d\theta_a^{(f,F)} d\phi_a^{(f,F)}}{2\pi} \frac{\sin\theta_a^{(f,B)} d\theta_a^{(f,B)} d\phi_a^{(f,B)}}{2\pi} \langle \mathbf{f}|\theta^{(f,F)},\phi^{(f,F)}\rangle \langle \theta^{(f,B)},\phi^{(f,B)}|\mathbf{f}\rangle \\ & \int \prod_a \frac{\sin\theta_a^{(i,F)} d\theta_a^{(i,F)} d\phi_a^{(i,F)}}{2\pi} \frac{\sin\theta_a^{(i,B)} d\theta_a^{(i,B)} d\phi_a^{(i,B)}}{2\pi} \langle \mathbf{i}|\theta^{(i,B)},\phi^{(i,B)}\rangle \langle \theta^{(i,F)},\phi^{(i,F)}|\mathbf{i}\rangle \\ & K_{cs}(\theta^{(f,F)},\phi^{(f,F)},\theta^{(i,F)},\phi^{(i,F)}) K_{cs}^*(\theta^{(f,B)},\phi^{(f,B)},\theta^{(i,B)},\phi^{(i,B)}) \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

where F means "forward" and B means "backward". The coherent-state propagator has a path integral representation

$$K_{cs} = \lim_{\epsilon\to 0} \mathcal{N}_\epsilon \int \prod_a \mathcal{D}\theta_a \mathcal{D}\phi_a e^{i\int \mathcal{L}_{kin} + \epsilon \mathcal{L}_{reg} + \mathcal{L}_S dt} \tag{10}$$

where $\mathcal{L}_{kin}$ and $\mathcal{L}_{reg}$ are Klauder's kinetic and regularization terms, $\mathcal{N}_\epsilon$ is a normalization, and $\mathcal{L}_S$ represents the interactions. The two coherent state propagators in (9) can therefore be written as a double path integral over "forward" and "backward" paths. I summarize for convenience the Klauder theory in App. C where I also give the explicit (and somewhat unwieldy) expression for $\mathcal{L}_S$ corresponding to (5). For compactness I shall write (9) as

$$P_{if}^{(0)} = \langle \mathbf{1} \rangle_{if} \tag{11}$$

where $\langle \cdots \rangle_{if}$ is a shorthand the averages implied by (9) and (10).

To the above model we now add a bath described by $\hat{H}_B$ and $\hat{H}_I$. The bath and the system are originally assumed to be in a product state $\rho_i^{TOT} = \rho_i \oplus \rho_i^B$, and the final total state is $\rho_f^{TOT} = U^{TOT} \rho_i^{TOT} (U^{TOT})^\dagger$ where U^{TOT}, analogous to U in (6) depends on the whole Hamiltonian. The reduced density matrix of the system only at the final time is $\rho_f = \mathrm{Tr}_B[\rho_f^{TOT}]$. The total unitary operator U^{TOT} can be represented as a path integral over the forward paths of both the system and the bath, and analogously for $(U^{TOT})^\dagger$. The initial density matrix of the bath ρ_i^B can also be represented as a function of the starting points of the forward and backward paths of the bath (both to be integrated over).

As was first shown in [19] the bath variables can then in principle be integrated out. Instead of the two coherent-state propagators in (9), each expressed as a separate path integral (10), we then instead have

$$K_{FV} = \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} |\mathcal{N}_\epsilon|^2 \int \prod_a \mathcal{D}\theta^F \mathcal{D}\phi^F e^{i \int \mathcal{L}_{kin}(\theta^F, \phi^F) + \epsilon \mathcal{L}_{reg}(\theta^F, \phi^F) + \mathcal{L}_S(\theta^F, \phi^F) dt} \int \prod_a \mathcal{D}\theta^B \mathcal{D}\phi^B e^{-i \int \mathcal{L}_{kin}(\theta^B, \phi^B) - \epsilon \mathcal{L}_{reg}(\theta^B, \phi^B) - \mathcal{L}_S(\theta^B, \phi^B) dt} e^{i \Phi_{FV}} \tag{12}$$

where

$$\Phi_{FV} = \Phi_{FV}[\theta^F, \phi^F, \theta^B, \phi^B] \tag{13}$$

is the Feynman-Vernon influence action. We can then write the second matrix element we are looking for as

$$P_{if} = \left\langle e^{i \Phi_{FV}} \right\rangle_{if} \tag{14}$$

When the Feynman-Vernon influence action is relatively small we therefore have

$$P_{if} - P_{if}^{(0)} \approx \langle \Phi_{FV} \rangle_{if} \tag{15}$$

Extracting a representative value $\overline{\Phi_{FV}}$ we have

$$\mathrm{TVD} = \sum_{\mathbf{f}} |P_{if} - P_{if}^{(0)}| \approx \overline{\Phi_{FV}} \tag{16}$$

Eq. (16) is the first result of this work. It should be read as an indication that the error made by the whole system is determined by a global description of the system and the environment and is proportional to the strength of the interaction between the two. In the following two section we will look at two (simple) models where the scaling of Φ_{FV} with system size can be estimated.

IV. THE SPIN-BOSON MODEL WITH ONE BATH PER SPIN

The first model of one spin interacting with the environment was the spin-boson model, extensively investigated in [23]. We are here concerned with general interacting spin systems and therefore use a different representation of spin histories than in [23], but the description of the bath and the coupling of the system and the bath will be the same. I will therefore refer to the model discussed here as the spin-boson model with one bath per spin. For one spin the terms $\hat{H}_I$ and $\hat{H}_B$ in (4) are [23]

$$H_{\text{spin-boson}}^{\text{one spin-one bath}} = \sum_n \hbar \omega_n (a_n^\dagger a_n + \frac{1}{2}) + \hat{S}_z \left(\sum_n \sqrt{\frac{\hbar}{2 m_n \omega_n}} C_n a_n + \text{c.c.} \right) \tag{17}$$

where $\hat{S}_z$ is the z-component of the spin and $a_n^\dagger$ and a_n and the creation and annihilation operators of harmonic oscillator labeled by index n. The mass and the frequency

of the harmonic oscillators are given by m_n and ω_n, and the strength of the interaction between the spin and the environment is given by C_n. For many spins the model discussed in this section assumes one set of terms as in (17) per spin, each with a different set of operators and $a_n^\dagger$ and a_n

In the path integral formulation we write instead the classical Hamiltonian representing the terms involving the environment as

$$H_{\rm bath} = \sum_n \frac{1}{2m_n} p_n^2 + \frac{1}{2} m_n \omega_n^2 x_n^2 + S_z \sum_n C_n x_n \quad (18)$$

where in the coherent-state path integral S_z is the function $\frac{1}{2}\cos\theta$, as discussed in App. C. The Feynman-Vernon functional in (13) can then be computed explicitly as a functional of the forward and backward spin histories, as outlined in App. D. We will here only need the estimate of the Feynman-Vernon action for one spin coupled to one bath given in (D9) and that the Feynman-Vernon actions from more than one disconnected systems add. The total Feynman-Vernon action in (13) is then estimated as

$$\Phi_{FV} \sim \eta \cdot n \cdot (t_f - t_i) \quad (19)$$

where n is the number of spins, η is an overall measure of the strength of the interaction between a spin and its bath, and $t_f - t_i$ is the duration of the process. Following (16) and assuming weak coupling (small η) we then have

$$\text{TVD} \sim \eta \cdot n \cdot (t_f - t_i) \quad (20)$$

Eq. (16) is the second result of this work. It should be read as a generalization (3) to a definite physical model where the interaction strength η plays the role of the elementary error ϵ, and where the number of qubits times the duration of the process ($n \cdot (t_f - t_i)$) plays the role of of the number of "noisy operations" L. While there are similarities there are also differences. In the model used in [12] time does not enter since the system is supposed to develop unitarily between the "noisy operations". This is somewhat unphysical as any quantum system will interact with the environment to some extent, and therefore decohere continuously. On the other hand, in the model considered here the complexity of the quantum operation that implements the computational task does not enter; all else equal it does not matter how many operations are performed in the same time window as long as the form and the strength of the interaction between each qubit and its bath remains the same.

V. THE SPIN-BOSON MODEL WITH ONE COMMON BATH FOR ALL SPINS

A model where each spin has its own bath supposes that each spin is located in a separate material with separate delocalized degrees of freedom. Although not inconceivable one may also consider the situation where all the spins are located in the same material and interacting with the same delocalized degrees of freedom. The interaction terms between the spins and one oscillator in the common bath are then described by the action

$$S[x_b, \{\theta_k^f\}] = \frac{1}{2} \sum_k \int_{t_i}^{t_f} C_b x_b(t) \cos\theta_k^f dt \quad (21)$$

where the interaction coefficients C_b for simplicity have been taken the same for all spins interacting with the same bath oscillator. We can re-write the right-hand side of (21) as $\frac{n}{2}\int_{t_i}^{t_f} dt C_n x_n(t) \overline{\cos\theta^f}(t)$ where n is the number of spins (qubits) and $\overline{\cos\theta^f} = \frac{1}{n}\sum_k \cos\theta_k^f$, and same for the backward path, and then integrate out the bath oscillators. The result will be a Feynman-Vernon influence functional of the two collective coordinates of the same structure as (D4) and (D5), and which can be written

$$\Phi = n^2 \frac{i}{\hbar} S_i[\overline{\cos\theta^f}, \overline{\cos\theta^b}] - n^2 \frac{1}{\hbar} S_r[\overline{\cos\theta^f}, \overline{\cos\theta^b}] \quad (22)$$

Formally (22) scales quadratically with number of spins (qubits). However, it is physically quite plausible that an increasing number of spins in the same material would take more place. One may think of either the spins are arranged along a line, or arranged on two-dimensional grid. In the first case one dimension of the system increases proportional to n while in the second case two dimensions of the system increase proportional to $\sqrt{n}$, and in both cases the interaction coefficient C between the isolated spin and a delocalized mode can be expected to scale as $1/n$. The number of modes in a small frequency interval $d\omega$ will increase as n and the overall bath power spectrum $J(\omega)$ therefore decreases as $1/n$. Combining these estimates one gets back the linear scaling in (20). Furthermore, the differences between the forward and backward paths are fluctuating quantities and at least in the high-temperature near-classical regime investigated in [20] one can expect $\overline{\cos\theta^f} - \overline{\cos\theta^b}$ to scale as $1/\sqrt{n}$. The real part of Φ in (22) would therefore give a contribution independent of the number of qubits (error rate scaling as $1/n$) while the imaginary part of Φ in (22) would give a contribution increasing slower than linearly (error rate scaling as $n^{\frac{1}{2}}$).

VI. THE TORIC CODE IN THE FEYNMAN-VERNON THEORY

A canonical model of quantum computing and quantum error correction is Kitaev's toric code [13]. In the simplest version, which will be considered here, an $N \times M$ lattice of spins are located at edges in a regular lattice on the 2-torus, and operated on by operators called stabilizers

$$A_s = \prod_{i \in \text{star}(i)} \sigma_i^x \qquad B_p = \prod_{i \in \partial p} \sigma_i^z \quad (23)$$

In A-type stabilizers $i \in \mathrm{star}(i)$ denote the spins (edges) in the neighbourhood of a vertex s and in B-type stabilizers $i \in \partial p$ denote the spins (edges) around a plaquette p; σ_i^z and σ_i^x are Pauli operators acting on spin i. All the stabilizers commute and the eigenspace of all of them measured simultaneously is four-dimensional. This Hilbert space can be identified with that of two spins, usually in this context called logical qubits, and Pauli operators on these two qubits are products of operators on the physical spins taken around the two basic circuits on the torus.

More complex versions of toric codes which can accommodate many more qubits will not be considered further here, nor the very considerable experimental challenges of actually building such systems; for a recent review, see [15]. The system on consideration hence consists of NM physical spins and a bath of harmonic oscillators developing according to (4) where in addition the stabilizers are continuously measured. The system Hamiltonian is thus

$$H_S = H_S(s_1^x, s_1^y, s_1^z, s_2^x, s_2^y, s_2^z) \tag{24}$$

where

$$s_1^x = \prod_{i \in C_1} \sigma_i^x \quad s_1^z = \prod_{i \in C_1} \sigma_i^z \quad s_1^y = i s_1^z s_1^x$$
$$s_2^x = \prod_{i \in C_2} \sigma_i^x \quad s_2^z = \prod_{i \in C_2} \sigma_i^z \quad s_2^y = i s_2^z s_2^x$$

are the Pauli operators acting on the logical qubits, and C_1 and C_2 are the two basic cycles of the torus.

A basis of the states of the physical spins is $|i_1, i_2, \ldots, i_{NM}>$ where $i_p = \pm 1$ denotes the up (down) state of spin p. An alternative basis is by above given by the k values of the z-components of logical qubits l_r (here $k = 2$) and the $NM - k$ values of the stabilizers $m_q = \pm 1$. These two bases are related by a unitary transformation

$$|\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{m}> = \sum_{\mathbf{i}} A_{\mathbf{i}}^{\mathbf{l},\mathbf{m}} |\mathbf{i}> \tag{25}$$

where $|\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{m}>$ denotes $|l_1, \ldots, l_k, m_1, \ldots, m_{NM-k}>$ and $|\mathbf{i}>$ denotes $|i_1, i_2, \ldots, i_{NM}>$. By orthogonality of the states of the stabilizers and the logical qubits we have

$$\sum_{\mathbf{i}} A_{\mathbf{i}}^{\mathbf{l},\mathbf{m}} \left(A_{\mathbf{i}}^{\mathbf{l}',\mathbf{m}'} \right)^* = \mathbf{1}_{l,l'} \mathbf{1}_{m,m'} \tag{26}$$

Now assume that over some stretch of time the measured values of all the stabilizers are constant. These are then not histories of quantum variables but known classical (constant) records. The interaction of the physical spins with one bath oscillator b gives an interaction Hamiltonian for the logical qubits

$$Q(\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{l}'; \mathbf{m}) = \langle \mathbf{l}', \mathbf{m}| \sum_r \hat{\sigma}_r^z |\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{m}\rangle$$
$$= \sum_{\mathbf{i}} A_{\mathbf{i}}^{\mathbf{l},\mathbf{m}} \left(A_{\mathbf{i}}^{\mathbf{l}',\mathbf{m}} \right)^* \left(\sum_r (-1)^{i_r} \right) \tag{27}$$

From these follow interaction Hamiltonians for the coherent-state representations of the histories of the logical qubits in the forward and backward paths

$$Q^F(\theta^{\mathbf{F}}, \phi^{\mathbf{F}}; \mathbf{m}) = \sum_{\mathbf{l},\mathbf{l}'} \langle \theta^{\mathbf{F}}, \phi^{\mathbf{F}} | \mathbf{l}' \rangle Q(\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{l}'; \mathbf{m}) \left\langle \mathbf{l} | \theta^{\mathbf{F}}, \phi^{\mathbf{F}} \right\rangle$$
$$Q^B(\theta^{\mathbf{B}}, \phi^{\mathbf{B}}; \mathbf{m}) = \sum_{\mathbf{l},\mathbf{l}'} \langle \theta^{\mathbf{B}}, \phi^{\mathbf{B}} | \mathbf{l}' \rangle Q(\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{l}'; \mathbf{m}) \langle \mathbf{l} | \theta^{\mathbf{B}}, \phi^{\mathbf{B}} \rangle$$

These more complicated functions Q^F and Q^B play the same role for the interaction of the toric code with a bath of oscillators as the sums of the cosines in the simple model discussed in Section V above, compare Eq. (21).

The influence functional is as in above estimated as

$$\Phi_{FV} \sim \eta \overline{Q}^2 (t_f - t_i) \tag{28}$$

where $\overline{Q}$ is a typical value of Q^F and Q^B. A rough estimate of $\overline{Q}$ follows from assuming that each element of A in (25) is about $2^{-\frac{NM}{2}}$ with a fluctuating sign, which is consistent with (26). $Q(\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{l}'; \mathbf{m})$ in (27) is then the sum of 2^{NM} terms of fluctuating sign, each of size about 2^{-NM} and hence of overall typical size $2^{-\frac{NM}{2}}$. Each of the two functions Q^F and Q^B is then further a sum of 2^k such terms and hence of typical size $2^{\frac{k-NM}{2}}$. The amplitude $\overline{Q}^2$ in (28) would then be 2^{k-NM}, and the influence of the bath on the states of the logical qubits exponentially small in system size.

A more systematic estimate of $\overline{Q}$ follows from observing that $Q(\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{l}'; \mathbf{m})$ is the matrix element of the operators coupling the system to the heat bath between two eigenstates the Kitaev model given by Hamiltonian

$$H_K = -\sum_s A_s - \sum_p B_p \tag{29}$$

The two states have the same quantum numbers $(\mathbf{m})$ determined by the eigenvalues of the operators A_s and B_p, and the same or different quantum numbers given by the logical operators acting on the logical qubits ($\mathbf{l}$ and $\mathbf{l}'$). It is known that the matrix elements of local operators in the ground state of the Kitaev model are exponentially small in system size [28]. For $(\mathbf{m}) = (1, 1, 1, \ldots, 1)$ the logical qubits of the toric code are therefore almost insensitive to interactions with bath. For excited states $(\mathbf{m}) \neq (1, 1, 1, \ldots, 1))$, the problem on the other hand appears more complicated, see [29, 30].

VII. DISCUSSION

In this work, stimulated by the challenge posed in [17], I have considered the error made by a quantum computer weakly coupled to an environment but which cannot be meaningfully described as a network of "noisy quantum gates". I have estimated the error by combining Klauder's path integral for spin and a Feynman-Vernon elimination of a thermal bath modeled as a set of harmonic oscillators interacting linearly with the spin. As

argued in [17] it is not necessary to suppose that the "noisy" quantum evolution is built on quantum operations that factorize over operations and over quantum gates. To the contrary it is possible to make a global estimate of the error based on the interaction between the quantum computer and its environment. In plausible simple physical models of some spins interacting with a bath of harmonic oscillators the conclusion is however the opposite of the pessimistic hypothesis of [17]: the total error scales at most linearly with system size (number of qubits) and time of operation, which is essentially the same scaling found by Aharonov, Kitaev and Nisan in [12].

In retrospect, the above is not a suprising result since the quantum semigroup assumption of a super-operator factorized over gates and in time physically appear in a high-temperature limit which should be less, and not more, suitable to quantum information processing. A very similar analysis as above can also be carried out for the original spin-boson model with arbitrary interactions between only the z-components of all the spins. In that case Klauder's coherent-state spin path integral is not necessary, and the Feynman-Vernon propagator for the density matrix can instead be represented by the double sum over jump processes developed in [23]. While this representation is simpler (it involves no limit process) its scope is also more limited and basically restricted to models of quantum annealing [31]. As those models have been argued to not be general enough to describe a quantum computer which can solve certain important tasks better than a classical computer [32, 33], I have here taken a more circuitous approach.

Further, I have applied the same approach to the toric code of Kitaev [13]. The computational elements are then "logical qubits" which are non-localized degrees of freedom, and not the elementary physical spins. The analysis brings out the fact that these elements are almost insensitive to interactions with the bath, at least in the ground state of the related Kitaev model where all the stabilizers (defined above) have value one. One consequence of this observation is that such an influence does not need to be corrected, as it is exponentially small in the system size. Recall again that an error described by general quantum operation on a mixed state of k logical qubits is an element of a set of real dimension $16k^4 - 4k^2$, a number which is 240 for $k = 2$. Such an error therefore cannot be reversed by applying external classical control fields on these qubits, as these only lead to unitary transformations which have real dimension $4k^2 - 1$. Correcting for errors described by general quantum operations would be a very high-dimensional control operation, and it is hence fortunate that they do not seem to be needed. Time-reversing general quantum operations was recently looked at in a more abstract setting in [34].

Finally, a thermal bath consisting of harmonic oscillators is a model of delocalized environmental modes such as phonons. The main degrees of freedom in a real material at very low temperature, such as defects and nuclear spins, are on the other hand likely to be localized, and may be more accurately described as a spin bath [35]. For this case it may be argued that the environment of each qubit consists in a finite set of neighboring spins the effects of which would in principle also be given by a Feynman-Vernon action as in (13). Although precise estimates of this action would be more difficult to obtain, there seems to be no reason to assume that the number of environmental spins interacting with one qubit scales with the number of qubits of the quantum computer.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I thank Gil Kalai for a stimulating discussion and Benjamin Huard, Petteri Kaski, Cris Moore, Sorin Paraoanu, Sergey Pershoguba and Karol Życzkowski for help and constructive remarks This research has been supported by the Swedish Science Council through grant 621-2012-2982, by the Academy of Finland through its Center of Excellence COIN, and by the Chinese Academy of Sciences CAS President's International Fellowship Initiative (PIFI) Grant No. 2016VMA002.

Appendix A: A quantum-mechanical formulation of Kalai's ϵ

The purpose of this appendix is to argue that the total variational distance as defined above in (1), counted per qubit, is a reasonable quantum mechanical interpretation of the error rate ϵ discussed in [17]. I emphasize that this interpretation can not be found [17], but is introduced here as a way to state the problem within Feynman-Vernon theory.

To do so we consider the special case where the quantum operation Φ_0, determined by a unitary transformation U, is such that there is a single final state $|f\rangle$ with $\langle f|\Phi_0\rho_i|f\rangle = 1$. Applying the quantum operation Φ_0 to $|i\rangle$ can then be said to yield $|f\rangle$ with certainty, and Φ_0 can then be called "noise-less". Applying the "noisy" quantum operation Φ and measuring all the qubits would on the other hand give the Boolean vector $\mathbf{f}$ with probability $1 - \epsilon'$ for some $\epsilon' > 0$ and a result different from $\mathbf{f}$ with total probability ϵ'. Let now further Φ be such that the probabilities $p(\tilde{\mathbf{f}})$ are sensibly different from zero only when the Hamming distance between $\tilde{\mathbf{f}}$ and $\mathbf{f}$ is at most one, *i.e.* when at most one qubit has been flipped, and let the probability to flip any one qubit be $\epsilon = \epsilon'/n$. The error rate so defined is then the same as $\frac{1}{2}$TVD, where TVD is defined in (1).

Appendix B: Kalai's pessimistic hypothesis

The purpose of this appendix is to argue that Kalai's pessimistic hypothesis claims that ϵ as introduced above in App. A scales linearly with number of qubits in the

quantum computer. The argument proceeds by selected quotes from [17]. We start from

> "The error rate in every realization of a universal quantum circuit scales up (at least) linearly with the number of qubits'

Readers of [17] will note that this statement is followed by

> "The effort required to obtain a bounded error level for any implementation of universal quantum circuits increases (at least) exponentially with the number of qubits"

which is equally important to Kalai's argument concerning universal quantum computers. In the present discussion, which focuses on the consequences for open quantum systems, I will however limit myself to the first part.

In [17] Kalai also argues by through the example of a depolarizing one-qubit channel described by

$$\Phi\rho = (1-p)\rho + p\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{1} \tag{B1}$$

where ρ is the density matrix of a qubit (a positive Hermitian 2-by-2 matrix of unit trace), Φ is the quantum operation (a linear operator of the set of such matrices on itself) and $\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{1}$ is the completely depolarized density matrix. The error rate is then taken to be p and, more generally

> "...error rate can be defined as the probability that a qubit is corrupted at a computation step, conditioned on it surviving up to this step"

which is followed by

> "...when we say that the rate of noise per qubit scales up linearly with the number of qubits, we mean that when we double the number of qubits in the circuit, the probability for a single qubit to be corrupted in a small time interval doubles"

In combination the above quotes imply that Kalai's pessimistic hypothesis states that the total error of the whole system scales at least quadratically with the number of qubits. In the interpretation used here, see App. A above, this is taken to mean that the total variational distance in (1) also scales at least quadratically. Similarly too App. A I emphasize that this quadratic global scaling cannot be found [17] but is a consequence of the further interpretations introduced here.

Appendix C: The Klauder coherent-state path integral for spin

This appendix summarizes properties pertaining to the Klauder coherent-state path integral. The coherent states are defined as

$$|\theta,\phi\rangle = e^{-i\phi\hat{S}_z}e^{-i\theta\hat{S}_y}|\uparrow\rangle = \begin{pmatrix} e^{-\frac{i}{2}\phi}\cos\frac{\theta}{2} \\ e^{\frac{i}{2}\phi}\sin\frac{\theta}{2}\end{pmatrix} \tag{C1}$$

The two angles $\theta\in[0,\pi]$ and $\phi\in[0,2\pi]$ parametrize the unit sphere with area 4π. The various matrix elements used in the main text and below are hence

$$\langle\uparrow|\theta,\phi\rangle = e^{-\frac{i}{2}\phi}\cos\frac{\theta}{2} \quad \langle\downarrow|\theta,\phi\rangle = e^{\frac{i}{2}\phi}\sin\frac{\theta}{2}$$

and the matrix element between two coherent states is

$$\langle\theta',\phi'|\theta,\phi\rangle = \langle\theta',\phi'|\uparrow\rangle\langle\uparrow|\theta,\phi\rangle + \langle\theta',\phi'|\downarrow\rangle\langle\downarrow|\theta,\phi\rangle = \cos\frac{\phi'-\phi}{2}\cos\frac{\theta'-\theta}{2} + i\sin\frac{\phi'-\phi}{2}\cos\frac{\theta'+\theta}{2}$$

When the two sets of angles are close this matrix element is

$$<\theta',\phi'|\theta,\phi> \approx 1 + \frac{i}{2}(\phi'-\phi)\cos\theta \tag{C2}$$

up to terms which are small as $(\phi'-\phi)^2$ and $(\theta'-\theta)^2$. Matrix elements of the operator for the z-component of spin are

$$\begin{aligned}\langle\theta',\phi'|\hat{S}_z|\theta,\phi\rangle = {} & \langle\theta',\phi'|\uparrow\rangle\langle\uparrow|\hat{S}_z|\uparrow\rangle\langle\uparrow|\theta,\phi\rangle + \\ & \langle\theta',\phi'|\uparrow\rangle\langle\uparrow|\hat{S}_z|\downarrow\rangle\langle\downarrow|\theta,\phi\rangle + \\ & \langle\theta',\phi'|\downarrow\rangle\langle\downarrow|\hat{S}_z|\uparrow\rangle\langle\uparrow|\theta,\phi\rangle + \\ & \langle\theta',\phi'|\downarrow\rangle\langle\downarrow|\hat{S}_z|\downarrow\rangle\langle\downarrow|\theta,\phi\rangle \\ = {} & \frac{1}{2}(\cos\frac{\phi'-\phi}{2}\cos\frac{\theta'+\theta}{2} + \\ & i\sin\frac{\phi'-\phi}{2}\cos\frac{\theta'-\theta}{2})\end{aligned} \tag{C3}$$

which when the two sets of angles are close means

$$\langle\theta',\phi'|\hat{S}_z|\theta,\phi\rangle \approx \frac{1}{2}\cos\theta \tag{C4}$$

Similarly

$$\langle\theta',\phi'|\hat{S}_x|\theta,\phi\rangle \approx \frac{1}{2}\sin\theta\cos\phi \tag{C5}$$

$$\langle\theta',\phi'|\hat{S}_x|\theta,\phi\rangle \approx \frac{1}{2}\sin\theta\sin\phi \tag{C6}$$

The vector $\vec{S} = \frac{1}{2}(\sin\theta\cos\phi, \sin\theta\sin\phi, \cos\theta)$ is the radial vector of length $\frac{1}{2}$, polar angle θ and azimuthal angle ϕ. The coherent states provide a partition of the unity in an overcomplete basis. Using (C2) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle\uparrow|\uparrow\rangle &= \int \frac{\sin\theta d\phi d\theta}{2\pi}\langle\uparrow|\theta,\phi\rangle\langle\theta,\phi|\uparrow\rangle = 1\\
\langle\uparrow|\downarrow\rangle &= \int \frac{\sin\theta d\phi d\theta}{2\pi}\langle\uparrow|\theta,\phi\rangle\langle\theta,\phi|\downarrow\rangle = 0\\
\langle\downarrow|\uparrow\rangle &= \int \frac{\sin\theta d\phi d\theta}{2\pi}\langle\downarrow|\theta,\phi\rangle\langle\theta,\phi|\uparrow\rangle = 0\\
\langle\downarrow|\downarrow\rangle &= \int \frac{\sin\theta d\phi d\theta}{2\pi}\langle\downarrow|\theta,\phi\rangle\langle\theta,\phi|\downarrow\rangle = 1
\end{aligned}$$

A time evolution operator can therefore be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{T}e^{-\frac{i}{\hbar}\int \hat{H}dt} = \prod_n \int \frac{\sin\theta_n d\phi_n d\theta_n}{2\pi}\cdots|\theta_{n+1},\phi_{n+1}\rangle\\
\langle\theta_{n+1},\phi_{n+1}|e^{-\frac{i}{\hbar}\int_{t_n}^{t_{n+1}}\hat{H}dt}|\theta_n,\phi_n\rangle\\
\langle\theta_n,\phi_n|\cdots
\end{aligned} \tag{C7}$$

If it can be arranged that two consecutive sets of angles are close, the interaction term (10) for the interaction Hamiltonian (5) is, using (C4) and (C5),

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}_S = -\frac{1}{2}\sum_a \mu_a^z\cos\theta_a + (\mu_a^x\cos\phi_a + \mu_a^y\sin\phi_a)\\
-\frac{1}{4}\sum_{ab}\kappa_{ab}^{zz}\cos\theta_a\cos\theta_b + \cos\theta_a\sin\theta_b(\kappa_{ab}^{zx}\cos\phi_b\\
+\kappa_{ab}^{zy}\sin\phi_b) + (\kappa_{ab}^{xz}\cos\phi_a + \kappa_{ab}^{yz}\sin\phi_a)\sin\theta_a\cos\theta_b +\\
\sin\theta_a\sin\theta_b(\kappa_{ab}^{xx}\cos\phi_a\cos\phi_b\kappa_{ab}^{xy}\cos\phi_a\sin\phi_b +\\
\kappa_{ab}^{yx}\sin\phi_a\cos\phi_b + \kappa_{ab}^{yx}\sin\phi_a\cos\phi_b + +\mu_a^y\sin\phi_a)\\
(\mu_b^x\cos\phi_b + \mu_b^y\sin\phi_b)
\end{aligned} \tag{C8}$$

where the factor $\hbar$ has been included for convenience, compare (5) and (10). For the discussion below and in the main text it only matters that (C8) is some definite function of the angles parametrizing the spin history.

To enforce that two consecutive sets of angles are close one uses a regularization term

$$\mathcal{L}_{reg} = \frac{1}{2}\left(\dot{\theta}^2 + \sin^2\theta\dot{\phi}^2)\right) \tag{C9}$$

The matrix element (C2) can then be written

$$\langle\theta',\phi'|\theta,\phi\rangle \approx e^{i\int_t^{t'}\mathcal{L}_{kin}} \tag{C10}$$

defining the kinetic term in (10):

$$\mathcal{L}_{kin} = \frac{1}{2}\cos\theta\dot{\phi} \tag{C11}$$

The regularization and interaction terms in (10) are as in (C9) and (C8) above. The canonical momenta conjugate to θ and ϕ are

$$p_\theta = \epsilon\dot{\theta} \qquad p = p_\phi = \epsilon\sin^2\theta\dot{\phi} + \frac{1}{2}\cos\theta \tag{C12}$$

As discussed in [24] and in [26], when ϵ is set to zero the remaining action is first order. The function $\frac{1}{2}\cos\theta$ then takes the meaning of momentum p, conjugate to ϕ. and the radial vector $\vec{S}$ can be written $\left(\frac{1}{2}\sqrt{1-4p^2}\cos\phi, \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{1-4p^2}\sin\phi, p\right)$. The Poisson brackets of the components of this vector satisfy the angular momentum relations. This suggests that in the path integral the operators $\hat{S}_x$, $\hat{S}_y$ and $\hat{S}_z$ should be translated into these functions S_x, S_y and S_z, which is indeed the prescription given by (C4), (C5), (C6) and (C8).

With the regularization (C9) the path integral is a standard one, and ϵ could be interpreted as the mass of a particle confined to move on the surface of a sphere of fixed radius. The path integral in curved space (as is the sphere) is a well-developed topic with several complexities [36], but for the present discussion, where the "mass term" is only for regularization, one can simply interpret the the integral of (C9) as a time discretization

$$\epsilon\int_{t_i}^{t_f}\mathcal{L}_{reg} \approx \sum_n \frac{\epsilon}{2\Delta t_n}\left(\Delta\theta_n^2 + \overline{\sin^2\theta}\Delta\phi_n^2\right) \tag{C13}$$

and where $\overline{\sin^2\theta}$ indicates *e.g.* mid-point prescription and the normalizing coefficient is

$$N_\epsilon = \prod_n (\overline{\sin^2\theta_n})^{\frac{1}{2}}\frac{\epsilon}{2\pi i\Delta t_n} \tag{C14}$$

The regularization and the normalization are a weight on the Fourier components of the spin history, and the path integral built on a discretization of (C11) and (C9) can therefore be written

$$\int\prod_k d\mu_\epsilon(\hat{\theta}_k,\hat{\phi}_k)e^{i\int\mathcal{L}_{kin}[\{\hat{\theta}_k,\hat{\phi}_k\}]} \tag{C15}$$

For finite ϵ this weight penalizes high Fourier components. Consider two realizations $\{\hat{\theta}_k,\hat{\phi}_k\}$ and $\{\hat{\theta'}_k,\hat{\phi'}_k\}$ which coincide at the two endpoints. The difference of their actions

$$\int\mathcal{L}_{kin}[\{\hat{\theta'}_k,\hat{\phi'}_k\}] - \int\mathcal{L}_{kin}[\{\hat{\theta}_k,\hat{\phi}_k\}] \tag{C16}$$

is the integral of $\mathcal{L}_{kin}$ around a closed path, which in turn equals the area on the surface of the sphere circumscribed by that path [26]. This area depends only weakly on high Fourier components and the limit of zero ϵ is therefore well-behaved.

Appendix D: The Feynman-Vernon method for spin histories

The starting point is the interaction and bath Hamiltonian for a single spin interacting with a bath:

$$H_{\rm bath}+H_{\rm I}=\sum_n \frac{1}{2m_n}p_n^2+\frac{1}{2}m_n\omega_n^2\left(x_n+S_z\frac{C_n}{m_n\omega_n^2}\right)^2 \tag{D1}$$

In above S_z is read $\frac{1}{2}\cos\theta$, the function representing the operator $\hat{S}_z$ in the Klauder path integral. The last term from expanding the squares in (D1), $\sum_n S_z^2\frac{1}{2}\frac{C_n}{m_n\omega_n^2}$, only depends on the spin history, and is a counter-term which it has become customary to include in the interaction term [20]. The two variables x_n and p_n are the coordinate and momentum of bath oscillator n with mass m_n and frequency ω_n. It is assumed that each bath oscillator is initially at thermodynamic equilibrium independent of the spin *i.e.* relative to

$$H_{\rm bath}=\sum_n \frac{1}{2m_n}p_n^2+\frac{1}{2}m_n\omega_n^2x_n^2 \tag{D2}$$

The bath oscillators can then be integrated out and the Feynman-Vernon influence functional is

$$i\Phi=\frac{i}{\hbar}S_i[\cdot]-\frac{1}{\hbar}S_r[\cdot] \tag{D3}$$

where

$$S_i=\int^{t_f}\int^{t}(S_z^f(t)-S_z^b(t))(S_z^f(s)+S_z^b(s))k_i \tag{D4}$$

$$S_r=\int^{t_f}\int^{t}(S_z^f(t)-S_z^b(t))(S_z^f(s)-S_z^b(s))k_r \tag{D5}$$

The kernels k_i and k_r depend on the bath spectral density

$$J(\omega)=\pi\sum_n\frac{C_n^2}{m_n\omega_n}\delta(\omega-\omega_n) \tag{D6}$$

as

$$k_i=\frac{1}{\pi}\int_0^\infty J(\omega)\sin\omega(t-s) \tag{D7}$$

$$k_R=\frac{1}{\pi}\int_0^\infty J(\omega)\cos\omega(t-s)\coth(\frac{\hbar\omega}{2k_BT}) \tag{D8}$$

where T is the temperature of the bath. In (D4) and (D5) for the the forward spin history $S_z^f=\frac{1}{2}\cos\theta^f$ and for the backward $S_z^b=\frac{1}{2}\cos\theta^b$. It is a consequence of the form of the coupling in the spin-boson model that the Feynman-Vernon action only depends on the polar angle θ and not on the the azimuthal angle ϕ.

Assuming that $J(\omega)$ behaves as $\eta\omega^s\omega_c^{-s-1}$ up to some large frequency Ω and decays quickly for larger frequencies [23] k_i and k_r will both be proportional to η (in units of ω_c). The kernel k_i will have support on a time interval of width Ω^{-1} and the kernel k_r will have support on a time interval of width the larger of Ω^{-1} and $\hbar/k_BT$. Both (D4) and (D5) can therefore be simply estimated as

$$S_i,S_r\sim\eta(t_f-t_i) \tag{D9}$$

where t_f-t_i is the duration of the process. This estimate is used above in the main text.

[1] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information* (Cambridge University Press, 2000)

[2] N. A. Gershenfeld and I. L. Chuang, Science **275**, 350 (1997), ISSN 0036-8075

[3] T. D. Ladd, F. Jelezko, R. Laflamme, Y. Nakamura, C. Monroe, and J. L. OBrien, Nature **464**, 45 (2010)

[4] J. Kelly, R. Barends, A. G. Fowler, A. Megrant, E. Jeffrey, T. C. White, D. Sank, J. Y. Mutus, B. Campbell, Y. Chen, Z. Chen, B. Chiaro, A. Dunsworth, I.-C. Hoi, C. N. and'P. J. J. O'Malley, C. Quintana, P. Roushan, A. Vainsencher, J. Wenner, A. N. Cleland, and J. M. Martinis, Nature **519**, 66 (2015)

[5] "D-wave smashes quantum computing record with 1,000 qubit system," International Business Times (June 2015)

[6] V. S. Denchev, S. Boixo, S. V. Isakov, N. Ding, R. Babbush, V. Smelyanskiy, J. Martinis, and H. Neven, "What is the computational value of finite range tunneling?." arxiv:1512.02206 (2016)

[7] N. D. Mermin, *Quantum Computer Science: An Introduction* (Cambridge University Press, 2007)

[8] S. Haroche and J.-M. Raimond, Physics Today, 51(August 1996)

[9] W. H. Zurek, Rev. Mod. Phys. **75**, 715 (May 2003)

[10] D. Deutsch, Proceedings of the Royal Society of London A **425**, 73 (1989)

[11] A. Barenco, C. H. Bennett, R. Cleve, D. P. DiVincenzo, N. Margolus, P. Shor, T. Sleator, J. A. Smolin, and H. Weinfurter, Phys. Rev. A **52**, 3457 (Nov 1995)

[12] D. Aharonov, A. Kitaev, and N. Nisan, in *Proceedings of the Thirtieth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, STOC '98 (ACM, New York, NY, USA, 1998) pp. 20–30, ISBN 0-89791-962-9

[13] A. Y. Kitaev, Russian Mathematical Surveys **52**, 1191 (1997)

[14] J. Preskill, Quant. Inf. Comput. **13**, 181 (2013)

[15] A. G. Fowler, M. Mariantoni, J. M. Martinis, and A. N. Cleland, Phys. Rev. A **86**, 032324 (Sep 2012)

[16] M. Mirrahimi, Z. Leghtas, V. V. Albert, S. Touzard, R. J. Schoelkopf, L. Jiang, and M. H. Devoret, New Journal of Physics **16**, 045014 (2014)

[17] G. Kalai, Notices of the AMS **63**, 508 (2016)

[18] H.-P. Breuer and F. Petruccione, *The Theory of Open Quantum Systems* (Oxford University Press, 2002)

[19] R. P. Feynman and F. Vernon, Ann. Phys. (USA) **24**, 118 (1963)

[20] A. Caldeira and A. Leggett, Physica A **121** (1983)

[21] A. Caldeira and A. Leggett, Annals of Physics **149** (1983)

[22] A. Caldeira and A. Leggett, Ann. Phys. (USA) **153** (1984)

[23] A. J. Leggett, S. Chakravarty, A. T. Dorsey, M. P. A. Fisher, A. Garg, and W. Zwerger, Rev. Mod. Phys. **59**, 1 (Jan 1987)

[24] J. R. Klauder, Phys. Rev. D **19**, 2349 (Apr 1979)

[25] M. Stone, Nucl Phys B **314**, 577 (1989)

[26] A. Atland and B. Simons, *Condensed Matter Field Theory* (Cambridge University Press, 2006)

[27] I. Bengtsson and K. Życzkowski, *Geometry of Quantum States* (Cambridge University Press, 2006)

[28] S. Bravyi and M. B. Hastings, Communications in Mathematical Physics **307**, 609 (2011), ISSN 1432-0916, http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00220-011-1346-2

[29] S. Bravyi and B. Terhal, New Journal of Physics **11**, 043029 (2009), http://stacks.iop.org/1367-2630/11/i=4/a=043029

[30] R. Alicki, M. Fannes, and M. Horodecki, Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical **42**, 065303 (2009), http://stacks.iop.org/1751-8121/42/i=6/a=065303

[31] T. Jorg, F. Krzakala, J. Kurchan, and A. C. Maggs, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101** (2008)

[32] T. Jorg, F. Krzakala, J. Kurchan, A. C. Maggs, and J. Pujos, EPL **89** (2010)

[33] V. Bapst, L. Foini, F. Krzakala, G. Semerjian, and F. Zamponi, Physics Reports **523** (2013)

[34] E. Aurell, J. Zakrzewski, and K. Życzkowski, Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical **48**, 38FT01 (2015), http://stacks.iop.org/1751-8121/48/i=38/a=38FT01

[35] N. V. Prokof'ev and P. C. E. Stamp, Reports on Progress in Physics **63**, 669 (2000)

[36] L. S. Schulman, *Techniques and applications of path integration* (John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1981)